



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RD  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,908	02/03/2004	Hsuan-Yin Lan-Harget	12938-006002	9781
27890	7590	06/29/2005		
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP 1330 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20036			EXAMINER SPIVACK, PHYLLIS G	
			ART UNIT 1614	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/769,908	HSUAN-YIN LAN-HARGEST ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Phyllis G. Spivack	1614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2-3-04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                                    |

Art Unit: 1614

A Preliminary amendment filed February 3, 2004 is acknowledged in which updated priority information is provided. Claims 1-7 are presented and represent all of the claims under consideration.

An Information Disclosure Statement filed February 3, 2004 is acknowledged and has been reviewed.

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

The recitation in claim 1 "comprising administering...an effective amount of propionoyloxymethyl propionate or butyroyloxymethyl butyrate" lacks clarity. A compound is generally considered a homogenous substance and a composition is generally a combination of two or more elements. Applicants may consider using the same language as that employed in the parent application.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-7 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,693,132. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the same compounds recited in the present claims are administered in the patented claims for use in treating the illness prostatic tumor growth or cancer.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,667,341. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of overlapping subject matter.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,699,902. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the patent are of close structural similarity to those presently claimed.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claims are directed to the treatment of any "illness" comprising administering propionoyloxymethyl propionate (POMP) or butyroyloxymethyl

Art Unit: 1614

butyrate (BOMB). The specification provides support for the treatment of prostate cancer or proliferation of prostate cells.

Attention is directed to In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 where the court set forth factors to consider when assessing whether or not a disclosure would require undue experimentation. These factors are:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided
- 3) the presence or absence of working examples
- 4) the nature of the invention
- 5) the state of the art
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

The instant specification fails to provide guidance that would allow the skilled artisan background sufficient to practice the instant invention without resorting to undue experimentation in view of further discussion below.

The nature of the invention, state of the prior art, relative skill of those in the art and the predictability of the art

The claimed invention relates to treatment of any illness.

The relative skill of those in the art is generally that of an M.D.

Each particular illness whether of a metabolic, immunologic, hematologic, microbial, etc. origin has its own specific characteristics and etiology. The broad

Art Unit: 1614

recitation "treating an illness" is inclusive of many conditions that presently have no established successful therapies.

It is clear the art to which the present invention relates is highly unpredictable and unreliable with respect to conclusions drawn from laboratory data extrapolated to clinical efficacy.

The breadth of the claims

The claims are very broad and inclusive of any illness.

The amount of direction or guidance provided and the presence or absence of working examples

The working example, Example 3, is limited to inhibition of proliferation of PC-3 prostate cancer cell line following the administration of POMB and BOMB.

The quantity of experimentation necessary

Applicants have failed to provide guidance as to which particular illnesses are contemplated, other than prostate cancer. The skilled artisan would expect the interaction of a particular compound in the treatment of a particular disease state to be very specific and highly unpredictable absent a clear understanding of the structural and biochemical basis for each agent. The instant specification sets forth no such understanding or any criteria for extrapolating beyond Example 3. No direction is provided to treat any other clinical condition. Absent reasonable *a priori* expectations of success for using POMB or BOMB to treat any illness, one skilled in the medical arts would have to test extensively various disease states to discover which particular pathology responds to treatment. Since each prospective embodiment, as well as

Art Unit: 1614

future embodiments as the art progresses, would have to be empirically tested, undue experimentation would be required to practice the invention as it is claimed in its current scope. The specification provides inadequate guidance to do otherwise.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran et al., U.S Patent 5,962,523.

Moran teaches the administration of iso-butyroyloxymethyl butyrate in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier to protect against injury to hair follicles that is the result of cancer. See column 7, line 49, as well as the section entitled Dosage and Formulation that continues through column 8. The claims differ only with respect to the designation "iso". However, one skilled in the art would have been motivated to administer butyroyloxymethyl butyrate to protect against injury to hair follicles in view of the teachings of Moran. Such would have been obvious in the absence of evidence to the contrary because of the very close structural similarity of the compounds. The structure disclosed by Moran on line in column 1, line 55, encompasses both compounds of instant claim one. The determination of an optimal dosage and mode of administration are parameters well within the purview of those skilled in the art through no more than routine experimentation.

Art Unit: 1614

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rephaeli, A., U.S. Patent 5,939,455.

Rephaeli teaches the administration of butyroyloxymethyl butyrate in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier to treat an illness that may be cancer, a hematological disease, an inherited disease or a metabolic disease. See column 1, lines 15-29, as well as the formula at the top of column 2. Further, see column 15 where pharmaceutical compositions are disclosed for various modes of administration and dosages.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Phyllis G. Spivack whose telephone number is 571-272-0585. The Examiner can normally be reached Mondays to Fridays from 10:30 AM to 7 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful after one business day, the Examiner's supervisor, Chris Low, can be reached at telephone number 571-272-0951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Phyllis Spivack*  
Phyllis G. Spivack  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1614

**PHYLLIS SPIVACK**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

June 26, 2005